

JUL 24 2008

# REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-14 are pending in the application and are finally rejected. By this paper, it is proposed to amend claim 1 in order to put the application into condition for allowance or to narrow the issues for appeal. Entry of these amendments and reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

## A. Claims 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action mailed January 25, 2008, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the limitation "comparing the second image of the passenger to a prior image of the passenger," in line 12 was found vague and indefinite because it was unclear whether the "prior image" referenced is the same "prior image" in line 5 or a different prior image. Claim 1 line 12 is amended from "a prior image" to "the prior image" for further clarification. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

## B. Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the office action mailed January 25, 2008, claims 1-3, 5-9, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mann et al (6,119,096) in view of Glenn et al (US2002/0004695).

Applicants respectfully assert that Mann does not render the instant invention obvious in view of Glenn because neither reference taken alone or in combination teaches or suggests all of the elements of claim 1. In the office action, the allowable subject matter within claim 1 was withdrawn based on the newly cited art Glenn. The office action points to §0012, §0024, §0026 and §0032. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited sections in Glenn merely show that video cameras may be placed on a plane for crash analysis and/or incident events. (See, for example §0012). Furthermore, Glenn teaches away from the present disclosure because Glenn

JUL 24 2008

teaches "recording image data of flight parameters and events," not a method for processing an international passenger.

Claim 1 is amended to further clarify that the second electronic image of the passenger is recorded and verified on an aircraft upon entry. Neither Mann or Glenn, taken alone or in combination disclose this unique feature of claim 1.

Applicants respectfully assert that Mann does not render the instant invention obvious in light of Glenn because neither reference teaches or suggests the elements of claim 1, or of dependent claims 2-3, 5-9, and 12-14. For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 is overcome and should be withdrawn. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-3, 5-9, and 12-14 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Anastasia Heffner  
Registration No. 47,638  
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200